

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 349

PS 009 222

AUTHOR Hare, Bruce R.
 TITLE Racial and Socioeconomic Variations in Preadolescent Area-Specific and General Self-Esteem.
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
 PUB DATE Feb 77
 NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at "Toward the Competent Parent: An Interdisciplinary Conference on Parenting" (Atlanta, Georgia, February 21-22, 1977)
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Grade 5; Measurement Instruments; Peer Acceptance; *Racial Differences; Research; Self Concept; *Self Esteem; *Social Differences; *Socioeconomic Background; *Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

This study of 210 fifth-grade children attempted to assess whether children of varying race, socioeconomic status (SES) and sex differ in their levels of general and area-specific (school, peer, and home) self-esteem. Also investigated was the question of whether children are capable of maintaining differing levels of esteem across the different areas of experience, and, if so, whether the capacity to do so varies with the subject's racial, SES, and/or sex characteristics. A 35-item general self-esteem scale devised for this study was administered. Findings indicated that there were variations in general and area-specific self-esteem across both racial and socioeconomic lines, although there were no significant differences by sex. There were significant differences in general, school, and peer self-esteem by SES with the upper SES group scoring higher. There was a significant difference in school self-esteem by race with the whites scoring higher. There were no significant differences in home self-esteem by race or SES. There were variations in the degree to which and order in which the area-specific esteems predicted general self-esteem both by race and SES. The study suggests that low SES exercises a greater "negative" influence on self-esteem than race; that the relationship of general self-esteem to the area-specific esteems, and the relationship of the area-specific esteems to each other varies across race and SES lines. (Author/SB)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED138349

Racial and Socioeconomic Variations in
Preadolescent Area-Specific and
General Self-Esteem

Bruce R. Hare

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Educational Psychology

PS 009222

Acknowledgements

This study was conducted as part of a dissertation completed at the University of Chicago in 1975 under a National Institute of Mental Health Fellowship. The author is grateful to the administrators, faculty, and students of the Evanston, Illinois school system for their cooperation in conducting the project, and to Professor Edgar G. Epps who advised through all stages of the project.

Bruce R. Hare, Ph.D.

B.A. (Sociology) The City College of the City University of New York, 1969

M.S. (Elementary Education) The City College of the City University of New York, 1971

M.A. (Sociology of Education) The University of Chicago, 1973

Ph.D. (Sociology of Education) The University of Chicago, 1975

Currently: Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology, College of Education,
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (217-333-2533)

Abstract

This study of two hundred and ten fifth-grade children of varying race, socioeconomic status, and sex, attempted to assess whether children of varying background differ in their levels of general and area-specific (school, peer, and home) self-esteem. It additionally investigated whether children are capable of maintaining differing levels of esteem across the different areas of experience, and, if so, whether the capacity to do so varies with the racial, SES, and/or sex characteristics of the subjects. The findings indicate that there are variations in general and area-specific self-esteem across both racial and socioeconomic lines, although there were no significant differences by sex. There were significant differences in general, school, and peer self-esteem by SES with the upper SES group scoring higher. There was a significant difference in school self-esteem by race with the whites scoring higher. There were no significant differences in home self-esteem by race or SES. There were variations in the degree to which and order in which the area-specific esteems predicted general self-esteem both by race and SES. The study suggests that low SES exercises a greater "negative" influence on self-esteem than race; that the relationship of general self-esteem to the area-specific esteems, and the relationship of the area-specific esteems to each other varies across race and SES lines. Finally the absence of significant differences in general self-esteem by race or significant differences in home self-esteem by race or SES suggests that both the caste-like group and the family exercise considerable positive influence, in protecting the child's sense of self-worth, despite the negative messages from outside others.

This study of child self-esteem was undertaken in order to reinvestigate the effects of race, socioeconomic status, and sex on child area-specific (school, peer, and home) and general self-esteem. The need for such a study emerged from the largely contradictory findings of recent studies which have varied from concluding that variations in child characteristics exercise no influence, to positing a causal relationship between the child's statuses and senses of self-worth. Since the study of child self-esteem is a relatively new area of sociopsychological inquiry, there are many methodological and theoretical problems to be solved. Older students, for example, tended to be of a psychiatric nature. Such psychiatrists or psychologists using a limited sample of a few subjects at most, made grand generalizations about the population at large, and frequently combined this approach with a victim or subgroup analysis framework when interpreting the results. The tradition has led researchers to posit lower self-esteem as subjects were found further from the "normative" (white, male, middle class) group.

This approach has been particularly prominent in studies of Black life in America where entry into the dominant group has been viewed as impossible by reason of color. Investigators of Black self-concept and self-esteem have traditionally assumed that every aspect of Black life is a reflection of group position, and that the group is incapable of rejecting the negative images of itself as perpetuated by the larger society. Thus Kenneth and Mamie Clark (1947) in a study that found Black children preferring white dolls to Black dolls, concluded the

white doll choice was a reflection of group self-hatred. E. Franklin Frazier (1957) and Nathan Hare (1965) extensively discussed the pathology associated with Black middle-class status, as a consequence of the group's rejection of their caste status for unattainable white middle-class status. It was, however, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) who clearly exemplified the negative analysis of Black subgroup status when they stated,

the Negro has no possible basis for a healthy self-esteem and every incentive for self-hatred. The basic fact is that in the Negro aspiration level, good conscience and even good performance are irrelevant in the face of the glaring fact that the Negro gets a poor reflection of himself in the behavior of whites, no matter what he does or what his merits are. The chief distinguishing factor in the Negro is that he must identify himself with the Negro, but this initiates the compensatory identification with the white who is also hated (p. 297).

With regard to class differences the general pattern of believed subscription to the central norms and values has held. However, the theoretical existence of access to membership in the normative group, has, or so social scientists assume, made it less necessary for other class and ethnic groups to develop the acute pathologies associated with the Black caste-like position. They are therefore posited to be less likely to experience ongoing conflicts between their membership and reference groups.

More recent studies of child self-esteem have moved from sheer psychological interpretation to direct measurement and from limited to larger and more representative sampling techniques. Although problems of interpretation still remain, significant progress has also been made in the development of specialized instruments. For example, both the Rosenberg (1971) and Coopersmith (1967) measures, attempted to measure general child self-esteem more systematically. In addition, the Coopersmith measure attempts to measure area-specific self-esteem (i.e., school, peer, and home).

This study combines aspects of both the Rosenberg and Coopersmith self-concept studies into a multi-variable study. Rosenberg studied general self-esteem with a wide sample of children of different races, sexes, and socioeconomic statuses. Coopersmith investigated area-specific as well as general self-esteem with a restricted (white, middle class, male, normal) sample. This study investigated both general and area-specific self-esteem using a representative sample.

This study posed four general questions for investigation.

I. Do children of varying backgrounds differ in their level of general self-esteem?

Results from recent studies of child self-esteem have been contradictory and therefore inconclusive with regard to whether children of different backgrounds differ in general self-esteem. For example, Wendland (1967), Hunt and Hardt (1969), Kohn (1969), and Powell and Fuller (1970) found Black children to have higher self-esteem than white children. On the other hand, Rosenberg (1965) and Gordon (1969) found white children to have higher self-esteem, while others found the two groups not to differ.

There has been considerably less investigation of the impact of sex and socioeconomic status on child self-esteem. Thus the effects of sex, SES, and racial characteristics on general self-esteem are still open to investigation as well as the question of how they interact in affecting self-esteem.

II. Do children of varying backgrounds differ in their level of area-specific self-esteem?

Little outside of studies of academic self-concept of ability, has been done in the area of comparing the attitudes of children of varying backgrounds toward themselves in specific contexts. Whereas the first question asks whether children differ in general self-esteem, this question specifically addresses the issue of whether they differ in home, school, and peer group self-esteem. Most measures have depended upon responses to a series of very general reflective questions as they combine to produce a sum score which is assumed to indicate a general concept of self-worth. Thus, for example, from Rosenberg's six item Guttman scale a researcher can deduce the comparative level of general self-esteem for an individual or group, but cannot deduce how subjects feel or compare in specific contexts. There is considerable room for suspecting that even the same general self-esteem scores for different individuals or groups do not necessarily mean that they also are the same in self-esteem applied to specific areas.

III. Do children of varying backgrounds differ in the components by which they arrive at their level of general self-esteem?

The question of whether the weighting of the areas of interaction

which contribute to general self-esteem differ with the racial and/or class backgrounds of children has received little attention and is also unresolved. However, if one accepts as this author does, that subgroup adaptation, socialization, and values differ in any way from the dominant group's, there is room to suspect differences in the computation of general self-esteem for members of different groups. This question specifically asks whether the relative contributions of the area-specific self-esteem, to general self-esteem varies with class and/or ethnicity.

IV. Are children capable of maintaining different levels of self-esteem across different areas of experience?

The general assumption that all children are immature and therefore incapable of distinguishing how they feel in different areas about themselves has discouraged work in the area. The Coopersmith work has been unique in its attempt to test whether children are capable of making such distinctions. While others have limited study to academic self-concept and general self-esteem, Coopersmith's measure was designed to cover three distinct areas of interaction for the child; home, school, and peers. Although he concluded that children do not differentiate in their self-evaluations across these areas, his restricted (white, middle-class, male, normal) sample leaves room for further investigation.

HYPOTHESES

With reference to the first question, whether children of varying backgrounds differ in their levels of general self-esteem, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing:

1. That the level of general self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by race.
2. That the level of general self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by socioeconomic status.
3. That the level of general self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by sex.

In positing these hypotheses the reasoning was that children of different races need not feel differently about themselves since, as the literature indicates, self-esteem is often more related to one's own group than any external group. In addition, since both the home and peer areas are usually racially consonant and self-segregating, the probability of encountering negative self-concept giving significant others is largely limited to areas of high contact with members of another group. For children, and particularly Black and/or poor children, such contacts are largely limited to schools manned by adults of different racial and/or class status. It is further assumed that the limited impact of such contacts combined with positive group forces will minimize the impact of such interactions on general self-esteem. With regard to socioeconomic background effect, although the same general principle holds, the mutual support, collegiality and general protectiveness characteristics of racial or ethnic solidarity are not attributed to classes in our society. Since class solidarity is not assumed to be as strong a force in positive self-esteem formation and protection, self-esteem is predicted to vary significantly by class but not race. It should be noted that since there are class distinctions

within racial groups, self-esteem is expected to vary by class with race

controlled. With regard to sex differences, the assumption is that since the study is concerned with the preadolescent (between 9 and 11 years of age) there is little reason to suspect any significant differences in general self-esteem, the components thereof, or area-specific self-esteem between boys and girls. This prediction is based both on the assumption that children of these ages are evaluated and self-evaluate with limited regard to sex, and on pretest findings which seemed to support this assumption.

With reference to the second question, whether children of varying backgrounds differ in their levels of area-specific self-esteem (school self-esteem, home self-esteem, and peer self-esteem), the following hypotheses were formulated for testing.

4. That the level of school self-esteem will be found to vary significantly by race.

5. That the level of school self-esteem will be found to vary significantly by socioeconomic status.

6. That the level of school self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by sex.

7. That the level of home self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by race.

8. That the level of home self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by socioeconomic status.

9. That the level of home self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by sex.

10. That the level of peer self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by race.

11. That the level of peer self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by socioeconomic status.

12. That the level of peer self-esteem will not be found to vary significantly by sex.

In positing these hypotheses the reasoning was as follows. School self-esteem is predicted to vary by race and socioeconomic status because of the discussed possibilities of differences between the school personnel and the child. The school is an area in which the child is most likely to suffer the consequences of distance from the theoretical child which the school is most prepared to educate. It is the author's belief that in schools of diverse ethnic and class populations, teacher treatment of children generally reflects both racial and socioeconomic bias, and that the children both sense and react to this bias. This differential treatment combined with the possibility of less relevant preparation and support for success in this diversified area should be reflected in comparatively lower school self-esteem for the lower class and/or Black children.

These same children should not vary in home self-esteem because the home area is a consonant racial and socioeconomic area for all children. In addition, the bonds of affectivity and mutual psychological support characteristics of the family, suggest that home self-esteem is specific to the evaluation of family members. Thus home self-esteem should not vary with the external impacts of race and/or socioeconomic status. The

peer area is also expected to be consonant for all group members. Peer self-esteem is therefore also predicted not to vary by race, SES, or sex.

With reference to the third question, whether children of varying backgrounds differ in components by which they arrive at their general self-esteem (i.e., the relative impacts of school, home, and peer group self-esteem) the following hypothesis was formulated for testing.

13. That the relationship of general self-esteem to the area-specific self-esteems will vary by race and socioeconomic status.

In positing this hypothesis the reasoning was that although general self-esteem is universal, in that all children evaluate their self-worth, the methods and ingredients of such a computation should logically vary with the class and ethnic status of the subjects. Given the known impact of class and race on socialization and self-perception it is assumed that their effect should be reflected in self-evaluation techniques. Thus if school, home, and peer esteem are seen as components of the general self-esteem, their comparative impacts on general self-esteem should vary by the race and/or socioeconomic status of the subjects. These posited variations need not be simply attributed to the rejection of dominant standards, but may be more functionally viewed as a reflection of subgroup standards, consistent with group's perception of its position within the society.

With reference to the fourth question, whether children are capable of maintaining different levels of self-esteem across different areas of experience (i.e., whether there can be significant differences between

home, peer, and/or school self-esteem) the following hypothesis was formulated for testing.

14. That children are capable of maintaining different levels of self-esteem across different areas of experience.

In positing this hypothesis the reasoning was that since there can be considerable differences in the modes by which the children's significant others evaluate them in their different areas of experience, the children necessarily develop a capacity to discriminate between areas and measure themselves according to relevant criteria.

THE MEASURE

In order to test the hypotheses, the author constructed a thirty-item general self-esteem scale. The scale combined items from the Rosenberg and Coopersmith scales with others of the author's making in an attempt to create a measure that is sensitive, and both general and area-specific. The necessity for creating such a new measure derived from an ability to assess area-specific (i.e., school, home, and peer) self-esteem from the Rosenberg general measure, and concern that the reported failure of the Coopersmith measure to detect differences in self-evaluation by children across different areas of experience may be due to a lack of sensitivity in the items, and the failure of the measure to emphasize the specific context in which the respondent is to answer the question.

The devised measure is therefore both general and area-specific. It is area-specific in that it is composed of three ten-item subscales (peer, school, and home). It is general in that the sum score on any ten-item subscale is treated as general self-evaluation for that area.

and the sum score of thirty items (or the three subscales) is viewed as the general self-esteem measure. There are two reasons for assuming that the sum of the three subscales (or thirty items) may be construed as a general self-esteem scale. The first, a theoretical justification, argues that since the school, peer, and home areas are the major areas of interaction for the child, there is little room for the pre-adolescent to develop a sense of self-worth independent of, or outside of them. Unlike the adult, the possibilities for the child to develop other significant areas of interaction and/or other significant others is minimal. Thus these three areas can be argued to represent something close to the child's universe for self-evaluation, and thus in combination they become a general self-esteem measure. The other reason is grounded in recent studies in statistics which suggest that the average score from a series of subscores equally weighted, are as good if not a better predictor of a general trend as any intuitive judgment or aggregate measure (Dawes and Corrigan, 1974).

The measure was pretested and correlated highly with the two established self-esteem measures. In fact the Hare general self-esteem scale (the sum of thirty items) was found to correlate .83 with both the Coopersmith general self-esteem schedule, and the Rosenberg general self-esteem measure which correlated with each other less highly at .74. In addition, each of the Hare subscales correlated most highly with its Coopersmith counterpart. The two home subscales correlated .65 and the school and peer social subscales .75. Thus, at the very least, the Hare measure can be argued to measuring processes similar to those

assessed by these two recognized measures, and to have combined aspects of both. The test-retest reliability of the measure over a three-month interval is also high, the values are, .56 for home, .61 for school, .65 for peer and .74 for the total or general self-esteem measure. A two-item general self-esteem measure composed of two of Rosenberg's eight items, was also included as an independent self-esteem indicator. The subscale correlated .84 with the total scale from which it was taken, .66 with the Hare scale, and .64 with the Coopersmith scale in the pretest. It was included to serve as an independent measure of general self-esteem for comparison with the Hare subscales, and as a further check on the validity of the Hare general self-esteem measure. The test-retest reliability of this two-item subscale was .42 and significant beyond the .05 level.

THE SAMPLE

The study used a representative sample of fifth grade students in four elementary schools in the Evanston School System. The population of 210 subjects was chosen so as to assure an adequate distribution of males, females, Blacks and whites, of all socioeconomic statuses. In controlling for age, the sample was limited to fifth graders (10-11 years old). The decision to choose fifth grade students was based on a desire to select a population old enough to comprehend the measures, while still preadolescent and therefore theoretically, not likely to experience fluctuations in their levels of self-esteem in accordance with changes in body image as in adolescence. There is sufficient literature to support the belief that both in stability and ability children at this age are an ideal sample for this kind of study.

As a determining instrument for class divisions, the Blau and Duncan (1967) index of occupational status was divided into thirds according to the occupation of the head of household. Thus those falling below thirty-four were categorized as lower class, those between thirty-four and sixty-four were categorized as middle class and those between sixty-four and ninety-six were categorized as upper-middle class. The attempt is to approximately divide the index such that the first point approximated the separation of manual from non-manual labor, and the second division approximates the point two-thirds of the way to the index. Blue collar, white collar categories included those thirty-four and below, and those above thirty-four respectively.

RESULTS

It should be noted from the beginning that as expected no significant differences were found between male and female students on any relevant criteria within or between races or socioeconomic status groups. Hypotheses three, six, nine, and twelve were therefore accepted. This section will therefore concentrate specifically on racial and socioeconomic hypotheses. The implications of the sex related findings will be discussed in the final section.

With regard to the first hypothesis, that the level of general self-esteem would not be found to vary significantly by race, the findings support the hypothesis. Table 1 indicates the results of a two by three analysis of variance (Black/white and upper-middle/middle/lower SES) which was used to test the impact of race, socioeconomic status,

and their interaction on general self-esteem. With socioeconomic status controlled, the level of general self-esteem was found not to vary significantly by race. On the other hand, as predicted by the second hypothesis, the level of general self-esteem was found to vary significantly by socioeconomic status. The higher the SES the higher the general self-esteem. These two findings remain the same whether the Hare General Self-Esteem Scale or the Self-Esteem Indicator are used as the measure of general self-esteem. The race/SES interaction was found not to be significant in either case. Hypotheses one and two were therefore accepted.

Insert Table 1 about here

With regard to the fourth and fifth hypotheses, that the level of school self-esteem would be found to vary significantly by race and by socioeconomic status, the findings were also consistent with the hypotheses. As indicated by Table 2, the school self-esteem of white and upper socioeconomic children was significantly higher than that of their counterparts. Again the race/SES interaction effect was not significant. Hypotheses four and five were therefore accepted.

With regard to the seventh and eighth hypotheses, that the level of home self-esteem would not be found to vary by race or socioeconomic status, the findings reported in Table 2 support the hypotheses. Home self-esteem was not found to vary significantly by either race or socioeconomic status, although the SES values suggest a trend toward

higher home esteem as SES rises. Again the race/SES interaction effect was not significant. Hypotheses seven and eight were therefore accepted.

With regard to hypotheses ten and eleven, that the level of peer self-esteem would not be found to vary significantly by race or socioeconomic status, the race prediction held, but the SES prediction did not. As indicated in Table 2, while peer group self-esteem would not vary significantly by race when class was controlled, it did vary significantly by class with race controlled. The higher the SES the higher the peer self-esteem. Thus hypothesis ten was accepted, but hypothesis eleven was rejected.

Insert Table 2 about here

Hypothesis thirteen posits that the relationship of general self-esteem to other areas of self-evaluation will vary by race and socioeconomic status. In order to investigate this hypothesis a set of three-step multiple regression analyses were run. The approach is concerned with the relationship between general self-esteem and the area-specific self-esteems. It is specifically geared toward testing the relative impacts of the peer, school, and home areas on general self-esteem for children of different backgrounds.

Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 report the results of a three-step multiple regression analyses which indicates that when the self-esteem indicator is used as the dependent variable there are differences in the relationship between the area specific esteems and general self-esteem across

racial and socioeconomic lines. It should be noted for example, that white collar whites are the only group for whom all area-specific esteems correlate significantly with the self-esteem indicator, and that the rank ordering of the area-specific esteems for this group differs from the others. They are also the only group for whom school esteem most most highly predicts general self-esteem. Home esteem is the highest predictor for all other groups. In fact, neither peer or school self-esteem correlated significantly with general self-esteem indicator for any groups other than white collar whites. At the very least it is clear that there are variations in the degree to which and order in which the areas of interaction predict general sense of self-worth across SES lines (between blue collar and white collar whites), and racial lines (between Black and white white collar subjects). Hypothesis thirteen was therefore accepted. It should be noted that additional analyses from this study which included additional independent variables, further supported this hypotheses, but space does not permit their presentation in this article.

Insert Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 about here

The fourteenth and last hypothesis specifically addressed the question of whether Coopersmith was correct in asserting, based on his restricted sample, that children are incapable of maintaining different levels of self-esteem across different areas of experience. Table 7 presents the intercorrelations for subjects between home, peer, and

school self-esteem as measured by the Hare subscales.

The findings suggest that Coopersmith's conclusion that children cannot differentiate across different areas of experience may have been incorrect. They also suggest why this may have been so. Coopersmith's sample was limited to white collar whites who in this study are not only the only group for whom school self-esteem accurately predicts general self-esteem, they are also the only group for whom all area-specific self-esteem measures intercorrelate at the .001 level.

Insert Table 7 about here

Our finding is therefore not inconsistent with his finding when comparing the same groups, and certainly one might erroneously deduce from this subsample alone that children do not differentiate across areas of experience in their self-evaluations. However, it is no less true that for both Black and white blue collar subjects, school and home self-esteems do not significantly correlate, nor does school and peer esteem for white collar Blacks, or peer and home esteem for blue collar whites. Although the small size of the blue collar white sample does leave room for caution, the data do suggest overall that children of varying socioeconomic and/or racial backgrounds are capable of maintaining different levels of self-esteem across different areas of experience. Hypothesis fourteen was therefore accepted.

This study raised four general questions for investigation which will not be reviewed in light of the findings. With regard to the first

question of whether children of varying backgrounds differ in their level of general self-esteem, the findings suggest that they do. General self-esteem was found to vary significantly by SES, although it did not vary significantly by race or sex. The data not only indicate that general self-esteem varies by background but also supports the author's thesis that socioeconomic status exercises a larger negative impact on general self-esteem than either race or sex. There appears to be considerable support for positing that although positive racial identity, insulation and collectivism can be effective mechanisms for Black self-esteem protection, they are not as effectively available to the low SES groups.

With regard to the second question of whether children of varying backgrounds differ in their level of area-specific self-esteem (school, peer, home) the findings again indicated that they do. There were significant differences in school and peer self-esteem by SES, the higher the SES, the higher the esteems. These findings not only support the thesis that groups differ in area-specific self-esteems, but suggest that such differences are directly tied to realistic assessments. For example, the finding of no significant differences in home self-esteem across racial or SES lines is consistent with this thesis, since the home is a consonant racial and socioeconomic area for all children. By the same token, the known self and/or imposed segregation between Black and white children both in and out of school, probably helped to produce no significant differences in peer self-esteem by race, although the subjects did vary by SES. Most interesting of all however,

were the significant differences in school self-esteem both by race and SES. This finding is consistent with the author's belief that the school is the area in which both the Black and lower SES child suffer most from their "negative" racial and/or socioeconomic characteristics.

With regard to the third question of whether children of varying backgrounds differ in the components by which they arrive at their general self-esteem, the findings suggest that they do. For example, Black and white children were found not to differ in general self-esteem when SES was controlled, but did differ in school self-esteem. If one accepts the idea that the school, peer, and home measures combine to become a general measure, then a significant difference in a subscore is a significant difference in a component of general self-esteem. The data more specifically indicated that home self-esteem is the greatest predictor of general self-esteem for both Black and white blue collar children, and for Black white collar children. It also indicated the school self-esteem, while the highest predictor for white collar whites, does not even correlate significantly with general self-esteem for the other groups. Finally, the results in indicating that the intercorrelations between home, school, and peer esteems were all significant only for white collar whites, further support of the author's thesis that it is for that population of children that all significant others are at the highest consensus, or at least perceived as such.

With regard to the last question of whether children are capable of maintaining different levels of self-esteem across different areas of experience, the findings strongly suggest that they are quite

capable of such differentiation. For example, school and home self-esteem were not even significantly correlated for any blue collar children, nor were peer and home for blue collar whites, or school and peer self-esteem for white collar Blacks. Thus as previously indicated, if children are incapable of differentiating across areas it is only true of white collar whites. Even in this case it is the author's belief that the subjects are not at all incapable, but simply reflecting the consensus of their significant others which tells them that they are to largely measure their self-worth by school achievement. The meanings of no significant sex related findings simply stated, are that either boys and girls have not begun in the preadolescent age to differ significantly in self-evaluations, or the instruments used and dimensions studied were not sensitive enough to tap such subtle differences as there were. Perhaps others may develop instruments specifically constructed to further investigate the impact of sex on self-evaluation for preadolescents of varying backgrounds.

IMPLICATIONS

The findings strongly suggest that there is considerable room to believe that children are more capable of, and sophisticated in self-evaluations than we usually think. Furthermore, the findings also suggest that such capacities to differentiate in self-evaluations across areas, and to discriminate in deciding which factors at what strength will enter as significant in computing one's concept of self-worth, are directly tied to the socioeconomic and/or racial characteristics of the subjects. In short, the author believes that the study supports

his thesis that such differentiations, are real, and that they reflect socialization and adaptations to group status. Although the nature, location, and size of the sample, make generalization somewhat tenuous, it is believed that the findings of the study have implications for children in similar circumstances. Finally, given the preliminary, and suggestive nature of the study, it is hoped that it will generate additional interest in attempting to further assess the nature of differences in the dimensions of self-esteem, the impact of race and/or socioeconomic status on self-esteem, and the relationship between the individuals, their significant others, and social acts, in self-esteem development and maintenance. In closing a quote from Everett Hughes (1958) on the importance of audience choice seems most appropriate.

One of the most important things about any man is his audience or his choice of several available audiences to which he may address his claim to someone of worth (p. 43).

References

- Blau, C., & Duncan, O. American occupational structure. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Clark, K., & Clark, M. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Harley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology of education. New York: Holt, 1947.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.
- Davis, A. Social-class influence on learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Dawes, R. & Corrigan B. Linear models in decision making. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81 (2), 95-106.
- Drew, E. & Teahan, J. Parental attitudes and academic achievement. In W. W. Charters & N. L. Gage (Eds.), Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1963.
- Frazier, E. Black bourgeoisie. New York: Free Press, 1957.
- Gordon, C. Looking ahead: self-conceptions, race, and family factors as determinants of adolescent achievement orientation. Social Relations Department, Cambridge: Harvard University, 1969.
- Hare, B. R. Black and white self-esteem in social science: An overview. Journal of Negro Education, 1977, forthcoming.
- Hare, B. R. The relationship of social background to the dimensions of self-concept (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 4350A.
- Hare, N. The Black Anglo-Saxon. New York: Marzani & Munsell, 1965.

- Hughes, E. Men and their work. New York: Free Press, 1958.
- Hunt, D. E. & Hardt, R. H. The effects of Upward Bound Programs on the attitudes, motivation, and academic achievement of Negro students. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 122-124.
- Hyman, H. The value systems of different classes. In S. Lipset (Ed.), Class, status, and power. Illinois: Free Press, 1953.
- Kardiner, A. & Ovesey, L. The mark of oppression. New York: Norton, 1951.
- Kohn, M. Class and conformity: A study in values. Homewood, Illinois, Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Parsons, T. The school class a social system: Some of its functions in American society. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 297-318.
- Powell, G. & Fuller, M. School desegregation and self-concept. Paper presented at meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, San Francisco, March 1970.
- Rainwater, L. Crucible of identity: The Negro lower-class family. Daedolus, 1966, 95 (1), 172-216.
- Rodman, H. The lower-class value stretch. Social Forces, 1963-4, 42, 205-215.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. New York: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rosenberg, M. The logic of survey analysis. New York, Basic Books, 1968.
- Rosenberg, M. What significant others. The American Behavioral Scientist, 1973, July-August, 829-860.
- Rosenberg M., & Simmons, R. Black and white self-esteem: The urban school child. Washington, D. C.: American Sociological Association, 1971.

- Shavelson, R., Hubner, J., Hubner, R., & Stanton, G. Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretation. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46 (3), 407-441.
- Simmons, R., Rosenberg, M., & Rosenberg, F. Disturbance in the self-image at adolescence. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 553-568.
- Smith, J., & Brache, C. When school and home focus on achievement. Educational Leadership, 1962-3, 20, 314-318.
- St. John, N. School desegregation outcomes for children. New York: Wiley, 1975.
- Turner, R. The social context of ambition. San Francisco: Chandler, 1964.
- Wylie, R. The self-concept. (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance for General Self-Esteem Measures

Source	DF	Hare Self-Esteem			Self-Esteem Indicator		
		mean square	F-Test	Significance	mean square	F-test	Significance
Race	1	66.51	0.76	0.393	0.77	0.55	0.461
SES	2	577.17	6.16	0.003**	7.23	5.11	0.007**
Race x SES	2	85.65	0.95	0.390	2.95	2.08	0.128
Unit	204	90.43			1.42		

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.*** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Area-Specific Self-Esteem Measures

Source	DF	School Self-Esteem			Home Self-Esteem			Peer Self-Esteem		
		mean square	F-Test	Significance	mean square	F-Test	Significance	mean square	F-Test	Significance
Race	1	74.61	4.53	0.035*	0.43	0.02	over 0.50	1.29	0.09	over 0.50
SES	2	85.06	5.16	0.007**	42.93	2.22	0.112	62.98	4.14	0.018*
Race x SES	2	6.33	0.38	over 0.50	28.66	1.49	0.230	18.11	1.19	0.307
Unit	204	16.49			19.33			15.23		

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.*** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Final Equation for Three Step Multiple Regression

Blue Collar Blacks

Multiple R = .60

Dependent Variable, Self-Esteem Indicator

Multiple R² = .36

n = 42

Independent Variable	r	Standardized Beta	Significance
Home Self-Esteem	.60	.60	.000***
School Self-Esteem	.16	.09	.529
Peer Self-Esteem	.17	.05	.737

* p < .05.

** p < .01.

*** p < .001.

Table 4

Final Equation for Three Step Multiple Regression

Blue Collar Whites

Multiple R = .97		Dependent Variable, Self-Esteem Indicator	
Multiple R ² = .93		n = 7	
Independent Variable	r	Standardized Beta	Significance
Home Self-Esteem	.91	.85	.014*
School Self-Esteem	.02	.60	.124
Peer Self-Esteem	.08	.57	.151

* p < .05.

** p < .01.

*** p < .001.

Table 5

Final Equations for Three Step Multiple Regression

White Collar Blacks

Dependent Variable, Self-Esteem Indicator			
Multiple R = .67			
Multiple R ² = .45		n = 22	
Independent Variable	r	Standardized Beta	Significance
Home Self-Esteem	.67	.70	.006**
School Self-Esteem	.37	.07	.757
Peer Self-Esteem	.27	.03	.887

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.*** $p < .001$.

Table 6

Final Equations for Three Step Multiple Regression

White Collar Whites

Multiple R = .68

Dependent Variable, Self-Esteem Indicator

Multiple R² = .46

n = 139

Independent Variable	r	Standardized Beta	Significance
School Self-Esteem	.61	.39	.000***
Home Self-Esteem	.44	.22	.002**
Peer Self-Esteem	.53	.24	.002**

* p < .05.

** p < .01.

*** p < .001.

Table 7

Inter-correlations of Area-Specific Self-Esteems

For All Groups

Measures	Blue Collar Blacks		Blue Collar Whites		White Collar Blacks		White Collar Whites	
	Correlation	Significance	Correlation	Significance	Correlation	Significance	Correlation	Significance
School								
and	0.12	0.162	-0.26	0.287	0.62	0.001***	0.38	0.000***
Home								
Peer								
and	0.41	0.004**	0.85	0.008**	0.35	0.053	0.59	0.001***
School								
Home								
and	0.30	0.027*	-0.38	0.200	0.38	0.043*	0.28	0.001***
Peer								
	n = 42		n = 7		n = 22		n = 139	

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.*** $p < .001$.